DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 609 CS 505 106

AUTHOR Spitzberg, Brian H.; Cupach, William R.
TITLE Self-Monitoring and Relational Competence.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (67th, Anaheim, CA, November 12-15, 1981).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Higher Education; Interaction; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Competence; *Predictor Variables; Role Perception; *Self Evaluation (Individuals)

ABSTRACT

Forty-nine college students participated in a study designed to determine the relationships among self-monitoring, relational competence, and relational intimacy. Each student was asked to find a willing conversational partner, to decide upon a conversation they had recently, and--without consulting with each other--to complete a questionnaire about that conversation. The questionnaire was composed of scales intended to measure perceptions of a partner's communication competence, perceptions of one's own competence, and self-monitoring behavior--the tendency of individuals to focus on internal or external cues for regulating self-behavior. It was hypothesized that self-rated competence would be positively related with self-ratings of other's competence and that self-monitoring would be positively associated with self-rated competence. Results, however, did not support these hypotheses. Self-monitoring appeared to have little effect on other-competence or on the correlation between self-competence and other-competence. Collectively, the findings indicate that the self-monitoring construct does not significantly predict competent interaction but may combine with competence to predict possible outcomes of competent interaction. References and tables are appended. (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED264609

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X The document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# SELF-MONITORING AND RELATIONAL COMPETENCE

Brian H. Spitzberg
Communication Arts & Sciences
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90007

William R. Cupach
Department of Communication
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian H. Spitzberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

## Abstract

The relationships among self-monitoring, relational competence, and relational intimacy were investigated in 49 dyads. It was predicted that self-monitoring, along with self-competence, would be positively associated with ratings of alter competence (i.e., alter's other-competence). It was also predicted that self-competence and self-monitoring would be highly and positively correlated. Results indicated statistically significant relationships, but the effect sizes associated with self-monitoring were negligible in both instances. In addition, self-monitoring appeared to have little effect on other-competence, or on the correlation between self-competence and other-competence. Finally, relational intimacy appeared to have minimal impact on ratings of other-competence. Collectively, the findings indicate that the self-monitoring construct does not significantly predict competent interaction, but may combine with competence to predict possible outcomes of competent interaction. Implications for both constructs (i.e., self-monitoring and relational competence) are discussed.

Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Conference, November 1981.



CS 505 106

The measurement and conceptualization of interpersonal communication competence continues to be a topic of major interest in our discipline (Bochner & Kelly, 1974; Larson, Backlund, Redmond, & Barbour, 1978; Phelps & Snavely, 1980: Wiemann, 1977). From an impression management perspective, competent interaction involves the creation of an image of appropriate and effective communication. Competent interaction, therefore, can be viewed as a form of interpersonal influence, in which an individual is faced with the task of fulfilling communicative functions and goals (effectiveness) while maintaining conversational and interpersonal norms (appropriateness). A difficulty with this conceptualization, and most others, concerns the proper perspective from which competence is judged. In a communicative relationship, individuals may have divergent perceptions of each other's competence in a given interaction. The present research intends to assess the competence of dyad partners both from an individualistic trait approach, and a dyadic, context-specific perspective. Specifically, we intend to examine the relationships among self-monitoring, self-competence, other-competence, and relationship intimacy. Two ends are served by this research: first, the interpersonal influence process will be better understood by an examination of the effects of self-monitoring on effective and appropriate interaction; second, the assessment of relational competence will be advanced by the use of intact natural dyadic relationships as units of study.

## SELF-MONITORING AND INTERACTION

Self-monitoring is a construct concerning individual tendencies to focus on internal or external cues for the regulation of self's behavior.

> The prototypic high self-monitor is one who, out of a concern for the situational and interpersonal appropriateness of his or her social behavior, is particularly sensitive to the expression and self-presentation of relevant others in social situations and uses these cues as guidelines for monitoring (that is, regulating and controlling) his or her own verbal and nonverbal self-presentation (Snyder, 1979b, p.89).

Snyder (1979b) contrasts this with the low self-monitor, who possesses a restricted repertoire of self-presentational skills. Low self-monitors attend to their internal affective and cognitive states, rather than the dynamics of the interactional context.

Self-monitoring tendencies presumably result in several predictable communicative competencies. For example, high self-monitoring individuals are likely to be adaptable. As Snyder (1979a) explains, "The well-developed impression management skills of high self-monitoring individuals ought to give them the flexibility and adaptiveness to cope quickly and effectively with a diversity of social roles" (p. 192). Adaptiveness is an integral component of interpersonal communication competence (Brunner & Phelps, 1980; Foote & Cottrell, 1955; Hale & Delia, 1976; Hart & Burks, 1972; Moment & Zaleznik, 1963; Ritter, 1979). Adaptability allows a person to adjust his/her communicative images and messages to the standards of appropriateness perceived in the situation.

"High self-monitoring individuals regard themselves as rather flexible and adaptive people who tailor their social behavior shrewdly and pragmatically to fit appropriate conditions" (Snyder, 1980, p. 92). This adaptiveness indicates a second important component of competent interaction: appropriateness.

High self-monitors are intent upon creating desired images for themselves while simultaneously communicating in ways appropriate to the interpersonal context. Thus, "the behavior of high self-monitoring individuals ought to be more sensitive to social and interpersonal cues to situational appropriateness than that of low self-monitoring individuals" (Snyder, 1979b, p. 94). This concern for appropriateness leads high self-monitors to focus on the environment and the rule maintenance cues of the other person(s) in the conversation (Ickes & Barnes, 1977). Research has found that high self-monitors tend to overattribute behavioral effects to other persons (Brockner & Eckenrode, 1979); to be sensitive to cues of deception (Brandt, Miller & Hocking, 1980); and to be "particularly knowledgeable about individuals who are prototypes of a wide variety of trait domains" (Snyder & Cantor, 1980, p. 222). In order to assure the appropriateness of their behavior, high self-monitors consistently and systematically test hypotheses about others in social interaction (Snyder & Campbell, 1980; Snyder & Swann, 1978). These findings collectively indicate that high self-monitors are other-oriented in attention and adaptation. Other-orientation is still another important component of competence (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981,

Feingold, 1977; Knapp, 1978).

The attributes of adaptiveness, concern for appropriateness, and other-orientation typify high self-monitors. These proclivities, in turn, explain why "high self-monitoring individuals are relatively situationally guided; low self-monitoring individuals are relatively dispositionally guided" (Snyder & Cantor, 1980, pp. 222-23). A concern for others is likely to lead a person to adapt-- to change one's behavior--in accordance with the perceived needs of the other person(s) in the situation. Several studies are supportive of the greater cross-situational consistency and behavioral inflexibility of low self-monitors (Rarick, Soldow & Geizer, 1976; Snyder & Swann, 1976; Snyder & Swann, 1978; Snyder & Tanke, 1976; Tunnell, 1980 Zanna, Olson & Fazio, 1980). Inversely, high self-monitors manifest variability in their communicative images across, and even within, situations.

Conceptually, self-monitoring is related to a broad repertoire of impression management skills. The construct is operationalized by the self-monitoring (SM) scale (Snyder, 1974). It is designed to define five specific components of self-monitoring: (1) a concern for appropriate self-presentation; (2) attention to social comparison information to guide appropriate behavior; (3) an ability to control and alter expressive behavior; (4) implementation of this skill in particular situations; and (5) cross-situational variability in actions (Snyder, 1979a). However, these components have not been confirmed by factor analysis

(Briggs, Cheek & Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980). Despite the instability of the factors in the SM scale, it appears to adequately discern the construct. In actual conversations, high self-minitors have been found to be effective and skilled in the art of interaction management (Dabbs, Evans, Hopper & Purvis, 1980; Ickes & Barnes, 1977). There is strong reason to expect, therefore, that high self-monitors will view themselves as being competent in conversational interaction.

## RELATIONAL COMPETENCE IN INTERACTION

Competence in interaction has been conceptualized in a multitude of ways (Spitzberg, 1981). Typically, competence is conceptualized as appropriate and effective communication. Appropriateness involves the maintenance of interpersonal rules and effectiveness concerns achievement of desired responses (Bochner & Kelly, 1974; Brandt, 1979; Knapp, 1978; Larson, Backlund, Redmond & Barbour, 1978; Wiemann, 1977). But appropriateness and effectiveness depend upon the relational context in which they are evaluated. And most extant measures are not sensitive to the dyadic perceptions that would compose the relational context of the interactants. In other words, communication competence is context-specific Powell, 1979). Yet, most instruments are either self-report trait measures (e.g., Bienvenu, 1971; Holland & Baird, 1968; Phelps & Snavely, 1980) or independent third party observer report (e.g., Brandt, 1979 Lowe & Cautela, 1978, Wiemann, 1977)

Recently, Cupach & Spitzberg (1981) constructed and validated a scale to assess relational partners perceptions of

each other's competence in a specific conversation. The instrument was constructed from a large pool of items drawn from several competence instruments, and applied to self and other in a given conversation. Thus, in a conversation between A and B, A assesses A's own conversational competence (AA) and B's competence (AB). B assesses B's own competence (BB) as well as A's (BA). Hence, the following perceptions are elicited from each dyad:

AA: A's perceptions of his/her own competence; i.e., A's self - competence

BA: B's perception of A's competence; i.e., A's other - competence

BB: B's perception of his/her own competence; i.e., B's self - competence

AB: A's perception of B's competence; i.e., B's other - competence

Consequently, each dyad member rates the competence of self and alter, and is rated by his/her conversational partner.

The criterion of interpersonal communication satisfaction, (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b,) a logical outcome of competent interaction, was found to be significantly and positively related ($R^2$ = .50) to ratings of other - competence (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981). Thus, the relational competence measure appears to adequately operationalize conversation specific competence. And repeated research findings indicate that self-monitoring is closely related to conversational competence. Yet, we have been unable to find any research that specifically addresses the relationships among interpersonal communication competence and self-monitoring.

## RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESES

One of the intriguing possibilities of interaction is that competent individuals may be able to enhance the conversational competence of another person. Competent individuals are able to maintain the flow of interaction, and possibly even increase another person's involvement in the conversation. Similarly, high self-monitors may assess awkwardness in another person and thereby compensate in their interaction. "One aspect of social skill is the ability to influence others; perhaps high self-monitors have a skill that encourages improved conversational performance in their partners" (Dabbs, et al., 1980, p. 283). Therefore, we predict that self-monitoring and self-rated competence will significantly predict ratings of the other person's competence (i.e., A's self-monitoring and A's self-competence will predict B's other-competence).

$H_1$: Self-monitoring and self-rated competence are positively associated with self-ratings of other's competence (i.e., A's SM + AA = AB; B's SM + BB = BA).

Research into self-monitoring has found consistently that high self-monitoring individuals are effective conversationalists and competent in interaction management. Therefore, we predict that self-monitors will tend to judge themselves as being competent in their conversations.

$H_2$: Self-monitoring is positively associated with self-rated competence (i.e., A's SM = AA; B's SM = BB)

Given the cross-situational adaptiveness and inconsistency of high self-monitors, it is likely that these individuals portray a variable image communicatively. Even though high self-monitors are likely to be competent, it may be that they

provide a fluctuating image across, and within, conversations and situations. This suggests that low self-monitors present a rather stable, easily perceived, communicative image (Snyder & Swann, 1978). Yet, the converse may also be true; high self-monitors, because of their adaptation and variability, will be viewed by others as competent. Thus, as a research question, we intend to answer the following query:

$RQ_1$: What is the relationship between self-monitoring and other-competence? In other words, how is one's self-monitoring (A's SM) related to one's competence as perceived by his/her partner (BA)?

If high self-monitors are variable in their image, then there should be little correlation between their self-rated competence and another person's rating of their competence. This is because the high self-monitor does not portray a consistent or easily ascertained image. However, for the low self-monitor, images of competence should be relatively easy to "read" and, therefore, self- and other-competence perceptions should be similar.

Finally, we are interested in discovering whether or not relational context significantly affects judgements of competence. It is reasonable to assume that intimate partners have different expectations of competence for each other than for less intimate individuals. As a result, we ask the following research question:

$RQ_2$: What is the relationship between perceptions of intimacy and judgements of conversational competence?

## METHOD

### RESPONDENTS

Forty-nine volunteers were obtained from speech com-

munication courses at a southwestern university. Each student was asked to find a willing conversational partner (outside of class) to participate with them in a "take home" survey. Hence, there were 98 respondents in all, constituting 49 dyads. Of this group, 70 percent were female. Ninety-five percent of the respondents were between the ages of 16 and 24.

PROCEDURES

Student volunteers were offered nomimal class credit for participating in this project. They were instructed to take a questionnaire packet home and to find a willing partner to participate with them. The following written instructions were included in each packet, and were included in oral instructions when eliciting volunteers for the research project:

> The procedure is as follows. There are two indentical questionnaire packets. You are to give one to the person you have chosen to participate with you (e.g., an intimate, friend, etc.) and you are to keep the remaining questionnaire. Without analyzing or discussing the matter in detail, your partner and you should decide upon a specific, extended (i.e., over 10 minutes long) face-to face conversation you have had with each other recently. We are interested in your perceptions of the same conversation. However, each of you will fill out the questionnaires separately on your own. Once you have decided upon the particular conversation, complete the questionnaires. Do not discuss the conversation any further until you have completed your questionnaires. Once completed, immediately seal the packets in the envelope provided and return to your professor during the next class meeting. Do not change any answers on the basis of discussion or further reflection. When the questionnaires are sealed in the envelope, feel free to discuss your reactions to the project.

Each questionnaire contained a total of 90 items (including demographic and contextual questions), and took approximately 15 minutes to complete. It was stressed that all questionnaires were anonymous.

INSTRUMENTS

Three self-report scales were included in each questionnaire. The other-competence scale (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981) assesses one's perception of his/her conversational partner's communication competence in a specified conversation. Subjects respond to 27 statements describing the "other" person on a scale from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree). Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated to be .90 in this investigation.

The self-competence scale (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981) elicits judgements of one's own communication competence in a given conversation. This scale contains 28 statements describing the respondent. Items are scaled in precisely the same manner as for other-competence--from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree). In the present study, the self-competence scale achieved a reliability of .91.

In an effort to replicate previously reported factor structures for self- and other-competence, factor analysis was performed. Each scale was submitted to principal components analysis with oblique rotation. Criteria for determining the appropriate number of factors to be rotated were identical to those used in the prior analyses of the scale: (1) eigenvalues of unrotated factors greater than one; and (2) Cattell's scree procedure. A defined factor was required to have at least two

items loaded at .50 or higher, with no secondary loading higher than .30.

Results of the factor analysis generally replicated previous findings. The self-competence scale exhibited three distinct factors: other-orientation, conversation skills, and self-centeredness (Table 1) Other-competence demonstrated two dimensions: other-orientation and conversation skills (Table 2).

Clearly, interpretation of the factor analysis must be guarded due to the relatively small sample size. However, because the results were consistent with previous findings based on a sample three times as large (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981), we believe that the data reported here provide support for the relative stability of the factor structures for the self-competence and other-competence scales.

The thrid instrument contained in each questionnaire was Snyder's (1974) self-monitoring scale. This measure consists of 25 true-false items. Consistent with other reported findings (Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980; Snyder, 1974) the coefficient alpha reliability for self-monitoring in this study was found to be .71.

DATA ANALYSIS

Hypothesis one predicts that self-competence and self-monitoring will account for a significant amount of variance in ratings of alter's competence. Stepwise multiple regression was conducted utilizing SPSS (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). To further elucidate the results, decomposition of variance was analyzed via commonality analysis (see Seibold & McPhee, 1979).

The second hypothesis predicts a high positive correlation between self-competence and self-monitoring. A Pearson product-moment correlation tested this hypothesis.

The first research question seeks an explanation of the relationship between self-monitoring and other-competence. That is, how is A's self-monitoring related to B's rating of A's competence. This was investigated by computing a Pearson product-moment correlation. In addition, we assessed the relationship between self-competence and other-competence as it is affected by self-monitoring. This was examined by categorizing respondents into high self-monitoring and low self-monitoring groups. A median split was utilized to maximize group sizes. Thus, those respondents above the median score on self-monitoring (38) were classified as high self-monitors; those below the median were classified as low self-monitors; and those individuals with median scores were excluded from this test. Self-competence and other-competence were then correlated for each group; the correlations were then compared.

Research question two asks what the effect of relational intimacy is on ratings of other-competence. To assess the effect of intimacy, the following categories were dummy-coded for purposes of a stepwise multiple regression analysis with one's competence as rated by their partner as the dependent variable; (1) spouse and romantic intimate; (2) close friend and friend; (3) aquaintance and stranger; (4) relative; and (5) coworker. The alpha level for all tests was set a priori at .05.

## RESULTS

Multiple regression analysis indicated that self-competence and self-monitoring combined to account for a significant amount of variance in ratings of alter's competence ($R^2$ = .37, F = 28.38, $p<.05$). However, most of this effect was due to the anticipated relationship between ratings of self-competence and alter's competence (r = .60). As commonality analysis showed, one's self-monitoring was relatively unimportant in predicting one's partner's other-comptence (see Table 3). Although the contribution of self-monitoring was statistically significant, the effect size was negligible. Hence, hypothesis one was only partially supported.

The zero-order correlation between self-competence and self-monitoring was also relatively low (r = .26). The effect size ($R^2$ = .07) was not sufficient to support the second hypothesis.

The overall correlation between self-monitoring and other-competence was not significant (r = .13, NS). The relationship between self-competence and partner's other-competence was found to be .39 for low self-monitors and .43 for high self-monitors. The difference between these two coefficients was nonsignificant (z = .221, NS).

When the dummy-coded intimacy variable was entered into a multiple regression equation to predict ratings of other-competence, a modest effect was found ($R^2$ = .14, F = 3.08, $p < .05$). Thus, in answer to research question two, it can be concluded that intimacy had minimal impact on other-competence ratings in this study.

## DISCUSSION

Failure to confirm any of the hypotheses raises serious doubts about the constructs of self-monitoring and relational competence. At the same time, several possible relationships and research directions are suggested. Before either construct is discarded, some of these possibilities need to be explored.

Despite a large amount of social-psychological research supporting the self-monitoring construct, it explained a negligible amount of variance in relational competence. Three reasons for this lack of explanatory power can be addressed. First, the self-monitoring scale possesses unimpressive internal consistency (.71). Social-psychological researchers typically have used median splits or other group dichotomy criteria. This practice maximizes the purity of the construct characteristics. It also results in a loss of data and risks serious statistical regression effects, so we chose to rely primarily on continuous ranges of data. The moderate reliability of the SM scale, combined with the inclusion of middle range scores, may have minimized any systematic relationships.

Second, trait constructs may have little interface with contextual measures (Mischel, 1973). The relational competence measure refers to a specific recent conversation. Self-monitoring refers to general tendencies that may have minimal applicability to specific, naturally occurring, contexts. In addition, self-monitoring may have little relevance in established relationships, in which cues are easily interpreted on the basis of well-developed interpersonal schemas.

Third, the validity of the self-monitoring construct must be examined critically. There are isolated research findings that cast suspicion on the validity of the self-monitoring construct. For example, rhetorical sensitivity involves other-orientation, interaction consciousness, and communicative flexibility. Yet, self-monitoring has a statistically significant, but very small relationship to rhetorical sensitivity (Hart, Carlson & Eadie, 1980). Davis (1978) found that self-monitoring was a relatively unimportant variable in mediating the strategic negotiation of intimacy in experimental dyads. Cunningham (1977) and Friedman, Prince, Riggio & DiMatteo, (1980) found self-monitoring to be an unimportant predictor of nonverbal expressiveness. Conceptually, competent interaction should include appropriate degrees of nonverbal expressiveness. And Dabbs, et al., (1980) found that high self-monitors were less adaptive than low self-monitors. Finally, and most importantly, research by Tunnell (1980) indicates that "the self-ratings of high SM subjects were markedly discrepant from the way their associates perceived them" (p. 229). This finding suggests that self-monitors see themselves differently than others see them. If so, there is not likely to be a consistent relationship between self-monitoring and observer assessment of high and low self-monitoring. In summary, self-monitoring may be limited in its ability to predict communicative behaviors or impression management in specific contexts. However, there is another possible explanation for our findings.

Self-monitoring is a cognitive tendency. Competence is a performance skill. It may be that they are complementary, yet noninteractive attributes. That is, in any given situation, self-monitoring may explain the concern or motivation for appropriate interaction, and competence may represent the success with which this concern is implemented behaviorally. The two variables can be viewed as contributing relatively unique variance to a third outcome variable such as satisfaction or confirmation. A somewhat similar situation was found by Lustig and King (1980) in which communication apprehension ahd no effect on knowledge of the appropriate strategies to use. In this case, skill had little relationship to knowledge. If this is true of self-monitoring and competence, then these variables might be ideal complementary predictor variables in a multiple regression model of competent outcomes. This is an important direction in which to extend the current study.

A second problematic area of this research concerns the measurement of relational competence. In the original construction and validation study, the authors indicated that certain dimensions of competent interaction may not have been tapped adequately by the item pool. It could be that the scale is not sensitive enough to discriminate subtle differences in conversational behavior, or even generic distinctions in impressions of competence. The validation study found that

other-competence was significantly associated with communication satisfaction. But self- and other-competence may not predict other outcomes of competent interaction. In addition, the possibility must be considered that communication satisfaction is more related to effectiveness, instead of appropriateness. If this is true, then other-competence and self-monitoring could be assessing two moderately related dimensions of competence--effectiveness and appropriateness. Again, this underscores the importance of assessing the relationships among self-monitoring, competence, and other criteria of competent interaction.

A final implication concerns an important avenue for future research. The lack of a significant relationship between self-monitoring tendencies and preceived level of competence, leads us to question the role of conscious self-awareness in the enactment of competent behaviors. It is widely recognized that the awareness and intentionality of communicative behavior vary significantly on broad continua. A vital question seems to be whether strategic self-awareness of communicative behavior is facilitative of communication competence. It is assumed that self-awareness enhances competence, but the findings of the current study suggest the need to explore this issue in greater depth. Several questions are relevant: Are "aware" communicators generally more competent than "unaware" communicators? Does <u>increasing</u> the self-awareness of communicators enhance their ratings of competence? Is self-awareness more important in some communicative situations and less important in others for competent interaction? And finally, to the extent that communicative self-awareness is important, how can it best be taught?

## References

Bienvenu, M.J., Sr. An interpersonal communication inventory. Journal of Communication, 1971, 21(4), 381-388.

Bochner, A.P., & Kelly, E.W. Interpersonal competence: Rationale, philosophy, and implementation of a conceptual framework. Speech Teacher, 1974, 23(4), 270-301.

Brandt, D.R. On linking social performance with social competence: Some relations between communicative style and attributions of interpersonal effectiveness. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5(3), 223-237.

Brandt, D.R., Miller, G.R., & Hocking, J.E. Deception detection as a function of self-monitoring and femiliarity: A study of differential accuracy in the perception of expressive behavior. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, New York, November 1980.

Briggs, S.R., Cheek, J.M., & Buss, A.H. An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 38(4), 679-686.

Brockner, J., & Eckenrode, J. Self-monitoring and the actor-observer bias. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1979, 9, 81-88.

Brunner, C.C., & Phelps, L.A. Interpersonal competence and androgyny. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Acapulco, Mexico, May 1980.

Cunningham, M.R. Personality and the structure of the nonverbal communication of emotion. Journal of Personality, 1977, 45(4), 564-584.

Cupach, W.R., & Spitzberg, B.H. Relational competence: Measurement and validation. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Jose, California, February 1981.

Dabbs, J.M., Jr., Evans, M.S., Hopper, C.H., & Purvis, J.A. Self-monitors in conversation: What do they monitor? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(2), 278-284.

Davis, J.D. When boy meets girl: Sex roles and the negotiation of intimacy in an acquaintance exercise. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36(7), 684-692.

Farber, B. Elements of competence in interpersonal relations: A factor analysis. Sociometry, 1962, 25(1), 30-47.

Feingold, P.C. Toward a paradigm of effective communication: An empirical study of perceived communicative effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37(8), 4697-4698A.

Foote, N.N., & Cottrell, L.S., Jr. Identity and interpersonal competence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Friedman, H.S., Prince, L.M., Riggio, R.E. & DiMatteo, M.R. Understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The affective communication test. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(2), 333-351.

Gabrenya, W.K., Jr., & Arkin, R.M. Self-monitoring scale: Factor structure and correlates. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1980, 6(1), 13-22.

Hale, C.L., & Delia, J.G. Cognitive complexity and social perspective-taking. Communication Monographs, 1976, 43(3), 195-203.

Hart, R.P., & Burks, D.M. Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. Speech Monographs, 1972, 39(2), 75-91.

Hart, R.P., Carlson, R.E., & Eadie, W.F. Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47(1), 1-22.

Hecht, M.L. Measures of communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(4), 350-368. (a)

Hecht, M.L. The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(3), 253-264. (b)

Hecht, M.L. Toward a conceptualization of communication satisfaction. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1978, 64(1), 47-62. (c)

Holland, J.L., & Baird, L.L. An interpersonal competency scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28(2), 503-510.

Ickes, W., & Barnes, R.D. The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interactions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35(5), 315-330

Knapp, M.L. Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Larson, C.E., Backlund, P., Redmond, M., & Barbour, A. Assessing functional communication. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1978.

Lowe, M.R., & Cautela, J.R. A self-report measure of social skill. Behavior Therapy, 1978, 9(4), 535-544.

Lustig, M.W., & King, S.W. The effect of communication apprehension and situation on communication strategy choices. Human Communication Research, 1980, 7(1), 74-82.

Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychology Review, 1973 80, 252-283.

Moment, D., & Zaleznik, A. Role development and interpersonal competence. Boston: Harvard University, 1963.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Phelps, L.A., & Snavely, W.B. Toward the measurement of interpersonal communication competence. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Western Speech Communication Association, Postland, OR, February, 1980.

Powell, R.G. Differentiation among social situations: An investigation of the role of the situational element in communication competency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1978.

Rarick, D.L., Soldow, G.F., & Geizer, R.S. Self-monitoring as a mediator of conformity. Central States Speech Journal,1976, 27,(4), 267-271.

Ritter, E.M. Social perspective-taking ability, cognitive complexity and listener-adapted communication in early and late adolescence. Communication Monographs, 1979, 46(1), 40-51.

Seibold, D.R., &,Mcphee, R.D. Commonality analysis: A method for decomposing explained variance in multiple regression analyses. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5(4), 355-365.

Snyder, M. Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30(4), 526-537.

Snyder, M. Cognitive, behavioral, and interpersonal consequences of self-monitoring. In P. Pliner, K.R. Blankenstein, & I.M. Spigel (Eds.), Perception of emotion in self and others: Advances in the study of communication and affect. New York: Plenum, 1979. (a)

Snyder, M. Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (vol. 12). New York: Academic, 1979. (b)

Snyder, M. The many me's of the self-monitor. Psychology Today, March 1980, 13(10), 33-40, 92.

Snyder, M., & Campbell, B. Testing hypotheses about other people: The role of the hypothesis. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1980, 6(3), 421-426.

Snyder, M., & Cantor, N. Thinking about ourselves and others: Self-monitoring and social knowledge. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(2), 2220234.

Snyder, M., & Swann, W.B. When actions reflect attitudes: The politics of impression management. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34(5), 1034-1042.

Snyder, M., & Swann, W.B. Hypothesis-testing processes in social interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36 (11), 1202-1212.

Snyder, M., & Tanke, E.D. Behavior and attitude: Some people are more consistent than others. Journal of Personality,1976, 44(3), 501-517.

Spitzberg, B.H. Competence in communicating: A taxonomy, review, critique, and construction of a predictive model. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, Anaheim CA, November 1981.

Tunnell, G. Intraindividual consistency in personality assessment: The effect of self-monitoring. Journal of Personality, 1980, 48(2), 220-232.

Wiemann, J.M. Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3(3), 195-213.

Zanna, M.P., Olson, J.M., & Fazio, R.H. Attitude-behavior consistency: An individual difference perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 38(3), 432-440.

TABLE 1

Self-Competence Factor Matrix
After Oblique Rotation

| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Item 28 | .56* | .30 | -.19 |
| Item 29 | .74* | -.07 | .11 |
| Item 30 | .16 | .58* | .10 |
| Item 31 | .58 | .22 | -.44 |
| Item 32 | .47 | .28 | -.13 |
| Item 33 | .13 | .39 | .18 |
| Item 34 | .54 | .09 | .39 |
| Item 35 | .80* | -.11 | -.24 |
| Item 36 | .36 | .23 | -.18 |
| Item 37 | .34 | .12 | -.06 |
| Item 38 | .40 | .09 | .02 |
| Item 39 | -.08 | .82* | -.01 |
| Item 40 | .21 | .53* | .01 |
| Item 41 | .04 | .60* | .01 |
| Item 42 | .62* | .08 | .14 |
| Item 43 | .28 | .34 | .06 |
| Item 44 | .05 | .60* | .17 |
| Item 45 | -.07 | .15 | .52* |
| Item 46 | .23 | .19 | .33 |
| Item 47 | -.13 | .60* | .06 |
| Item 48 | .25 | .06 | .67* |
| Item 49 | -.08 | .79* | -.10 |
| Item 50 | .28 | .35 | -.12 |
| Item 51 | .53* | .23 | .04 |
| Item 52 | .73* | -.01 | .13 |
| Item 53 | .46 | .24 | -.20 |
| Item 54 | .60* | -.21 | .14 |
| Item 55 | .69* | -.06 | .29 |
| Eigenvalues | 8.36 | 1.99 | 1.53 |

*indicates primary factor loading.

TABLE 2

Other-Competence Factor Matrix
After Oblique Rotation

| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|---|---|---|
| Item 1 | .58* | -.11 |
| Item 2 | .54* | .12 |
| Item 3 | .69* | -.04 |
| Item 4 | .56* | .24 |
| Item 5 | .62* | .14 |
| Item 6 | -.13 | .44 |
| Item 7 | .59* | -.04 |
| Item 8 | .67* | .13 |
| Item 9 | .18 | .26 |
| Item 10 | .11 | .52* |
| Item 11 | -.01 | .55* |
| Item 12 | .14 | .25 |
| Item 13 | .68* | .10 |
| Item 14 | -.07 | .67* |
| Item 15 | .58* | .08 |
| Item 16 | .07 | .59* |
| Item 17 | .13 | .56* |
| Item 18 | .54* | .01 |
| Item 19 | .71* | -.18 |
| Item 20 | .57* | -.06 |
| Item 21 | .04 | .44 |
| Item 22 | .65* | .01 |
| Item 23 | .61* | .01 |
| Item 24 | .50* | .12 |
| Item 25 | .78* | .03 |
| Item 26 | .63* | .02 |
| Item 27 | .82* | -.05 |
| Eigenvalues | 8.33 | 1.77 |

*indicates primary factor loading.

TABLE 3

Variance in Other-Competence Associated
With Self-Competence and Self-Monitoring

| | | % Explained Variance |
|---|---|---|
| Unique to Self-Competence (SC) | .3027 | 30% |
| Unique to Self-Monitoring (SM) | .0134 | 1% |
| Common to SC and SM | .0579 | 6% |
| Total | $R^2$= .3740 | 37% |